Manitoba
July 2000

OFFICE OF THE
PROVINCIAL AUDITOR

Business Planning and Performance Measurement:

An Assessment of Timeliness of Implementation and Effectiveness of the Process in Departments

Vision

As a leader in promoting enhanced accountability of government to the citizens of Manitoba, the Office of the Provincial Auditor will contribute to greater public trust and confidence in the institutions of government.

Mission

To contribute to effective governance by the Manitoba Legislature, we provide the Members of the Legislative Assembly with independent assurance and advice on:

government accountability information;

compliance with legislative authorities; and

the operational performance of government.

Values

IN INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Respect *Honesty*

Integrity *Openness*

IN ACHIEVING OUR VISION AND MISSION

Teamwork

Independence

Balanced Perspectives

Professional Excellence

100-06921/

Office of the Provincial Auditor
500-330 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 0C4

July 2000

The Honourable Peter M. Liba
Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba
Room 235, Legislative Building
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0V8

Dear Sir:

I have the honour to submit herewith our July 2000 report on Business Planning and Performance Measurement: An Assessment of Timeliness of Implementation and Effectiveness of the Process in Departments to be laid before Members of the Legislative Assembly in accordance with the provisions of Section 13 of the Provincial Auditor's Act.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon W. Singleton, CA, CISA
PROVINCIAL AUDITOR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REFLECTIONS OF THE PROVINCIAL AUDITOR 1

REPORT OVERVIEW 3

HISTORY 9

PURPOSE, SCOPE AND APPROACH TO THE ASSESSMENT..... 10

SURVEY FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS 12

FOLLOW-UP ON PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PROVINCIAL AUDITOR 33

OVERALL ASSESSMENT 33

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS 34

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER..... 35

GOVERNMENT POSITION 36

In 1996/97, the Government of Manitoba launched a business planning and performance measurement initiative that requires all provincial departments to prepare business plans and to meausre their performance. This initiative, known as Manitoba Measures, was to be implemented through a phased approach over a three year period, under the direction of a small team of staff within the Treasury Board Secretariat. Different departments were slated to come on stream over the period of 1997/98 to 1999/2000.

From the outset, I have been a strong supporter of the Manitoba measures initiative mainly because business planning and performance measurement has several important benefits to offer. Properly implemented a business planning process can meaningfully contribute to:

- priority setting by government;
- strategic management by departments;
- resource allocation;
- internal and external communication of government goals, objectives, strategies and performance; and
- accountability.

As with any process, business planning and performance measurement evolves and is refined over time. Indeed, it may take several years before the process and the product reach an optimal level of maturation. From the outset, we have been monitoring progress in the implementation of Manitoba Measures. This report provides our most comprehensive review to date. It examines whether departments have an effective process by which to undertake business planning and performance measurement within a reasonable time frame.

It is my conclusion that departments are eager and willing to pursue business planning and performance measurement to its full potential. To do this, departments need the green light from Government, the right mix of resources from central agencies to assist them with what remains as the biggest challenge - performance measurement - and a process, which actively engages ministers, cabinet, civil servants, clients and citizens.

Jon W. Singleton, CA, CISA

Report Overview

INTRODUCTION

Under an initiative know as Manitoba Measures, which was announced in fiscal year 1996/97, all departments are required to prepare business plans and performance measures. Business planning and performance measurement was to be phased in among departments over a three-year period starting in 1997/98 with the last departments slated to come on stream in 1999/2000. A small working group of staff in Treasury Board Secretariat directs Manitoba Measures.

PURPOSE AND APPROACH TO THE ASSESSMENT

PURPOSE

In September 1999, a new Provincial Government took office. It is therefore timely to provide the new Government with an external assessment and recommendations regarding the implementation of the business planning and performance measurement initiative by provincial departments.

The objectives of the assessment are:

1. To determine whether there is an effective process in place to ensure timely implementation of business planning and performance measurement by Provincial departments; and
2. To determine the status of the Provincial Auditor's 1997 and 1998 recommendations regarding business planning and performance measurement.

APPROACH

A questionnaire was developed and completed by Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers/ Executive Equivalents (some departments have assigned responsibility for preparation of business plans to senior executives other than assistant deputy ministers) and departmental co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement.

Our findings and conclusions are based on comparing the responses we received from survey respondents against a set of criteria and sub-criteria that are detailed in the main report.

CONCLUSIONS AND KEY SURVEY FINDINGS

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

Based on the assessment criteria detailed in the report that follows, our overall conclusion is that departments have developed as effective a process as they can within the existing framework of the guidelines and directives of Manitoba Measures. However, certain elements that are critical to the effectiveness of the business planning and performance measurement process have either not yet been incorporated into the process or else they have only been partially developed (e.g. systematic monitoring, inter-departmental co-ordination, public reporting on performance, integration of planning and budgeting). Departments await direction from the central administration on these matters. As such, the sooner further central direction can be provided to departments, the sooner needed improvements in the process can be implemented.

KEY SURVEY FINDINGS

According to the survey findings, positive features in the business planning process of most departments include:

- A good level of participation by Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers/ Executive Equivalents in the process;
- A planning process that tends to involve a cross-section of departmental staff;
- Making in-roads into conducting client satisfaction surveys and/or consultations in regards to some departmental programs;
- Consciously attempting to ensure that business plans reflect and reinforce the government's vision and goals for Manitoba; and
- Beginning to make attempts at monitoring progress in implementing the business plan.

Some departments have explored creative approaches to communicating with and involving staff and their minister in the planning and performance measurement process. Examples of these types of initiatives are:

Engaging Departmental Ministers

- A couple of departments reported that the starting point for their business planning process was to hold a strategic planning session with their minister to identify the minister's broad goals and priorities and to obtain feedback from the minister on the department's proposed goals.

Communicating with Staff

- In one department the deputy minister meets with each division of the department to present and discuss with the staff the strategic directions and key priorities of the department.
- A couple of departments have developed booklets summarizing the business plan for the purpose of distributing them to all departmental staff.

Staff Involvement in the Process

- One department reported that as a way to expose as many staff as possible to the process, they annually include approximately 50% of departmental staff on a rotational basis in their annual strategic planning workshop.

Monitoring Performance Data Collection

- One department holds regular workshops with staff who are responsible for data collection in order to ensure quality control and that staff from different divisions/branches are correctly collecting the right data in the right way. This forum allows for on-going guidance to staff as necessary.

Based on the survey findings, areas that need to be addressed are:

- Providing opportunities for Cabinet ministers to be involved in the process;
- The lack of inter-departmental co-ordination of the content of business plans and the selection and collection of performance data;
- The need to broaden the mix of expertise available to provide central co-ordination and guidance to departments;
- The limited skills throughout Government in the area of performance measurement;

- The limited input from clients/stakeholders in shaping the business plan or performance indicators selected;
- The limited extent to which performance measurement is taking place at this point in time;
- The general absence of a systematic approach to collecting and analyzing performance data;
- The utilization of performance data to its full potential; and
- Almost no public reporting on the content of business plans or performance outcomes.

FOLLOW-UP ON PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PROVINCIAL AUDITOR

The Provincial Auditor requested in writing that the Treasury Board Secretariat provide us with their response to each of the Provincial Auditor's 1997 and 1998 recommendations regarding Manitoba Measures. The Treasury Board Secretariat responded that while their staff agree with many of the recommendations previously made by the Provincial Auditor, implementation of such changes has not proceeded at this time. The Secretariat indicated that there are many pressing issues facing the new Government and, as a result, the Secretariat has not yet had an opportunity to brief the new administration on the Manitoba Measures initiative. They expect to be in a position to do so in the coming months.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

STRATEGIC DIRECTION AND LEADERSHIP INVOLVEMENT

- Cabinet needs to establish and periodically review a Government-wide Corporate Framework within which departments can develop business plans and performance measures that contribute to the implementation of the Corporate Framework.
- The Clerk of Executive Council needs to develop a procedure and format for Cabinet or a committee of Cabinet to review and endorse the proposed strategic direction of departments, their key outcomes and key performance indicators.
- The Secretary to Treasury Board needs to develop a procedure and format for Treasury Board ministers to review and approve each department's business plan and performance indicators.

BUSINESS PLANNING AND BUDGETING

- Government should consider the merits of having both the Clerk of Executive Council and the Secretary to Treasury Board co-lead the business planning and performance measurement initiative in order to reinforce that this process is as much about planning and policy setting as it is about finances.
- The Treasury Board Secretariat should explore leading practices in North America in order to develop, for Treasury Board ministers' approval, the proposed approach for the integration of estimates with the business planning process.
- The Treasury Board Secretariat should prepare for Treasury Board ministers' consideration, an assessment of the implications of instituting multi-year fiscal planning at the departmental level.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

- The Treasury Board Secretariat should prepare, for approval by Treasury Board ministers, options for delegation of authority to departments once their business plan is approved.

CLIENT INPUT

- Those who will in future be responsible for central co-ordination need to develop, for Cabinet approval, options for obtaining input from clients and citizens in the process of setting government-wide as well as departmental strategic goals and performance indicators.

SKILLS AND EXPERTISE

- The Clerk of Executive Council and the Secretary to Treasury Board as the administrative co-leaders need to provide departments with access to a team of persons with direct experience in facilitating business planning and performance measurement. Each facilitator should be assigned to approximately four or five departments, that are functionally inter-related. Their role would be to provide departments with direct, hands-on assistance in refining their business plans and, in particular, their performance measures.
- Those who will in future be charged with central co-ordination need to provide departmental staff with opportunities to expand their knowledge and experience with business planning and performance measurement. For instance, use the inter-departmental co-ordinators network to identify the areas where departmental co-ordinators are seeking to increase their knowledge and provide workshops in those areas as well as guest speakers from other jurisdictions to share their positive experiences/lessons learned with business planning and performance measurement.

CO-ORDINATION OF PLANS AND INDICATORS

- The Clerk of Executive Council and the Secretary to Treasury Board should co-chair a steering committee of deputy ministers with the primary objective of providing deputies with a forum to ensure inter-departmental co-ordination in business planning and performance measurement and to resolve emerging issues and challenges.
- In future, the evaluation of business plans and performance indicators by central co-ordinators or Treasury Board analysts should include observations to Treasury Board ministers on any issues in the plans that relate to inter-departmental co-ordination.

MONITORING, DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

- Those charged with central co-ordination of business plans should establish a protocol for departments to follow in regards to monitoring of business plan implementation, performance data collection and reporting.

OUTCOME INDICATORS

- Government needs to emphasize to the central administration that greater emphasis needs to be placed on outcome indicators.
- The Clerk of Executive Council and the Secretary to Treasury Board need to ensure that departmental staff have access to expertise to assist them in developing outcome indicators.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTING

- The Clerk of Executive Council and the Secretary to Treasury Board should strike a committee to develop for Cabinet's approval a new format for departmental annual reports that include reporting on business plans and performance.

KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

Fundamental questions that we suggest need to be considered in relation to the above recommendations are:

- What amount of time is appropriate for ministers to devote to business planning and performance reporting?
- Are ministers willing to let public servants and clients/stakeholders participate in the development of meaningful indicators?
- How can central government staff develop the capacities to assist and challenge departments?
- How can the right information systems be developed?
- What incentives can be designed to encourage ministers and the administration to analyze and utilize performance-based information?
- To what extent should remuneration be based on performance?

History

Under an initiative known as Manitoba Measures, which was launched in fiscal year 1996/97, all departments are required to prepare business plans and performance measures. Business planning and performance measurement was to be phased in among departments over a three-year period starting in 1997/98 with the last departments slated to come on stream in 1999/2000. Departmental business plans and performance measures had to fit within a "Corporate Framework" established by the previous administration. This "Corporate Framework" outlined in broad terms the Government's vision, core businesses, goals, performance measures and expected outcomes.

A small working group of staff in Treasury Board Secretariat directs Manitoba Measures. Among other things, the working group prepared a Guide to assist departments in developing their business plan and performance measures; training workshops were also coordinated by the Secretariat's working group.

PROVINCIAL AUDITOR'S 1997 AND 1998 ASSESSMENTS

The Provincial Auditor's 1997 Report to the Legislative Assembly commented that Manitoba Measures was a positive initiative and suggested that the following be considered in developing future phases of Manitoba Measures:

- finding opportunities for public input in setting government priorities and strategic goals; and
- public reporting on business plans and performance.

The 1998 report of the Provincial Auditor contained a chapter that examined the implementation strategy guiding Manitoba Measures and recommended the need to focus on addressing the following:

- ensuring that the level of delegation of authority supports the effective accomplishment of objectives set out in the business plan;
- designing the appropriate linkage between the estimates process and the business planning process;
- assessing the implications and options for instituting multi-year fiscal planning at the departmental level;
- planning for publication of summary business plans; and
- designing a process for periodic review and renewal of the Corporate Framework.

REASON FOR THE REVIEW

Business planning and performance measurement has the potential to impact on government's decisions regarding priorities, the design and redesign of programs, and the allocation of resources. Given its wide impact and potential benefits if properly implemented, it is important to monitor and evaluate whether this tool is used effectively.

Several issues were identified in the 1997 and 1998 reports of the Provincial Auditor on business planning and performance measurement. There are two main reasons why we believe it is timely to follow-up on the status of the 1997 and 1998 Provincial Auditor's recommendations and to include a review of the process to date:

1. The period for the three-year phase-in of Manitoba Measures ended in 1999/2000; and

2. A change in Government took place in September 1999 and we believe an external assessment will be useful to the Government's decision-making on adjustments to the business planning and performance measurement process.

Purpose, Scope and Approach to the Assessment

PURPOSE

The objectives of the assessment are:

1. To determine whether there is an effective process in place to ensure timely implementation of business planning and performance measurement by Provincial departments; and
2. To determine the status of the Provincial Auditor's 1997 and 1998 recommendations regarding business planning and performance measurement.

SCOPE

Our assessment sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of leadership and guidance available from government, departmental deputy ministers, assistant deputy ministers and the central government administration?
2. How do departments go about developing business plans and performance measures?
3. Are the public or departmental clients involved in any way in business planning and performance measurement?
4. Do those charged with co-ordinating business planning and performance measurement within their department and those charged with central co-ordination of Manitoba Measures have the necessary skills?
5. Is there a process in place for ensuring business plans are consistent with Government priorities and ensuring inter-departmental co-ordination of business plans and performance measures?
6. Is there any plan monitoring and what type of performance data is being collected?
7. For departments that are measuring performance, how is performance measurement information being utilized?
8. Does the public have access to the general content of business plans and the results of performance measurement?
9. How has Treasury Board Secretariat responded to the specific recommendations made by the Provincial Auditor in 1997 and 1998 in regards to Manitoba Measures?

APPROACH

A set of criteria and sub-criteria were developed to assess whether there is an effective process in place to ensure that business planning and performance measurement is implemented in Provincial departments within a reasonable time frame. These criteria and sub-criteria are based on the National Quality Institute's Canadian Quality Criteria for the Public Sector and the Malcolm

Baldrige standards of quality. Table A presents the criteria and sub-criteria as well as the indicators of effectiveness associated with each criteria/sub-criteria.

TABLE A

CRITERIA, SUB-CRITERIA AND INDICATORS OF EFFECTIVENESS

LEADERSHIP	Strategic Direction	Visible and tangible government support for business planning and performance measurement.
		Presence of a clear government vision including expected outcomes and performance indicators.
		Government review/approval of departmental corporate direction, performance measures and performance reports.
	Leadership Involvement	The most senior administration (Clerk of Executive Council and Secretary to Treasury Board) play a visible and on-going role in directing the process.
		Those tasked with central co-ordination provide guidance, direction, facilitation and co-ordination across departments.
		Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers provide direction and support within their departments.
PLANNING	Development Process	Departments have a defined process by which to proceed.
		Departments involve staff from different units within their department.
		Departments communicate with all staff about the business plan.
	Problem Solving	A mechanism is in place for resolution of difficulties that arise in preparing a business plan and performance indicators.
		Decision-making related to problem solving is clear, decisive and can be counted on to endure.
CLIENT FOCUS	Client Input	Clients have opportunities for input into and influence over business plan priorities/strategic directions and the performance measures.
	Client Satisfaction	Client satisfaction is measured.
HUMAN RESOURCES	Skills and Training	Qualified staff are assigned to co-ordinate the process within departments and centrally.
		Networking and other similar opportunities are available to persons assigned to co-ordinate the process within departments and centrally.
PROCESS MANAGEMENT	Co-ordination	A process is in place for ensuring inter-departmental co-ordination and harmonization of business plans and performance indicators.
		A process is in place to ensure that business plans address Government priorities and are consistent with Government priorities.
	Plan Monitoring and Collection of Data on Performance	A system is in place to monitor progress in implementing the business plan.
		Performance indicators that focus on outcomes have been developed.
		A system is in place for collecting data on performance and data is collected.
	Outcome of Performance Measurement	The results of performance analysis impact on decision-making by departments and Government.
	Accountability Reporting	Broad parameters of the content of business plans is available to the public.
		Reporting to clients and citizens at large on results of performance.

A questionnaire was developed and completed by Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers/ Executive Equivalents and departmental co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement (some departments have assigned responsibility for preparation of business plans to senior executives other than Assistant Deputy Ministers). In total there were 49 respondents to the survey - a response rate of 79.0% representing all departments. As well, two representatives from Treasury Board Secretariat were surveyed. Survey work was conducted during the winter of 2000. The findings and conclusions in this report are based on comparing the responses we received from survey respondents against the criteria and sub-criteria in Table A.

Survey Findings and Analysis

CRITERIA: LEADERSHIP

SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS

- There appears to be an absence of visible and tangible Government support for business planning and performance measurement.
- A clear government vision including expected outcomes and performance indicators is not in place.
- Since the inception of Manitoba Measures, Cabinet has not been involved in the review/approval of departmental corporate direction or business plans, performance measures and performance reports.
- In general, the most senior administration (Clerk of Executive Council/Secretary to Treasury Board) has not, in the past, tended to be visibly involved in leading the process nor in directing the process on an on-going basis.
- Although Manitoba Measures has tried its best to provide guidance to departments, most departments feel there is room for enhancing the expertise available through Manitoba Measures and for it to be more directly involved with departments.
- The Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents generally seem to be actively involved in directing and supporting the business planning and performance measurement process within their departments.

DETAILED ANALYSIS

Sub-criteria: Strategic Direction

Indicator No.1: Visible and tangible government support for business planning and performance measurement.

Question:

Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents were asked to comment on the ways in which they felt the present Government was supporting the development of departmental business plans and performance indicators.

Response:

- The majority of respondents felt that, to date they have not received any signals that the new Government supports business planning and performance measurement.

TABLE 1

HOW IS THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT SUPPORTING BUSINESS PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT?

Response	% Respondents
No indication of support by new Government to date	53.5%
Some signs of support	39.3%
Individual Ministerial support evident	7.0%

Note: In all tables percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

- Those who indicated there are some signs of the new government supporting business planning and performance measurement cited the following as examples of the presence of this support:
  - The continued existence of Manitoba Measures;
  - Treasury Board requesting departments to prepare program profiles for the current fiscal year;
  - The attention given by Treasury Board in reviewing business plans submitted by special operating agencies; and
  - The interest by Treasury Board that departments continue to work on developing their performance indicators.
- Those who indicated their Minister supported business planning and performance measurement felt that this support was demonstrated by an interest in departmental strategic planning and the identification of departmental priorities.

Indicator No. 2: Presence of a clear government vision including expected outcomes and performance indicators.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked whether in their opinion there is currently a clear corporate framework (i.e. government objectives, priorities, and expected outcomes) within which their department could develop its business plan and performance indicators.

Response:

- The overwhelming majority of respondents are not clear on the Government's vision and corporate goals.

TABLE 2

IS THERE CURRENTLY A CLEAR GOVERNMENTAL VISION/CORPORATE FRAMEWORK?

Response	% Respondents
Lack of clear Governmental framework	94.0%
Clear Governmental framework	5.8%

Generally, those who felt that there is not a clear governmental vision, want the new Government's framework to provide more detail than the previous administration's corporate framework.

Indicator No. 3: Government review/approval of departmental corporate direction, performance measures and performance reports.

Question:

Senior officials were asked whether it is the new Government's intention to continue the Manitoba Measures initiative and whether Cabinet, Caucus and or Treasury Board Ministers intend to become involved in business planning and performance measurement.

Response:

- Senior officials advised that at this point in time, a detailed discussion with the Government on these matters has not taken place. Senior officials indicated that the priority for the incoming Government is to develop the budget. A discussion on the future of business planning and performance measurement is therefore not expected to take place with the Government until sometime in the summer of 2000.

Sub-criteria: Leadership Involvement

Indicator No. 1: The most senior administration (Clerk of Executive Council and Secretary to Treasury Board) play a visible and on-going role in directing the process.

Question[1]:

Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents were asked to provide their perception of the role that the Clerk of Executive Council played in the past with respect to business planning and performance measurement. Respondents were also asked to indicate any changes they would like to see in future with respect to the Clerk's role in this initiative.

Response:

- The majority of respondents were not aware of what role the Clerk of Executive Council played in relation to business planning and performance measurement (Table 3).
- A large majority would like the Clerk of Executive Council to be more involved in the process (Table 4).

[1]**Note**: Recognizing that a new Government was elected in September 1999, and new persons were appointed to the position of Clerk of Executive Council and Secretary to Treasury Board, the purpose of the next series of questions is to try to learn from the past by asking respondents to give their perception of the roles the previous incumbents played in relation to business planning and performance measurement.

TABLE 3

ON THE PAST ROLE OF THE CLERK OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL IN RELATION TO BUSINESS PLANNING & PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

Response	
Not aware of Clerk's role	56.6%
Clerk launched Manitoba Measures	20.0%
Clerk supported Manitoba Measures (respondents provided no e.g.s on the type of support)	20.0%
Held meetings to inform Deputy Ministers of government goals and objectives	3.3%

TABLE 4

WHAT IS THE DESIRED ROLE OF THE CLERK OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL IN BUSINESS PLANNING & PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT?	
[illegible]	[illegible]
Greater level of involvement	83.3%
Not sure on role Clerk ought to play	13.3%
Someone in Central Government needs to drive process (either Clerk or Secretary of Treasury Board)	3.3%

- The 83% who want the Clerk of Executive Council to have increased involvement, would like to see it manifested in the following ways:

TABLE 5

HOW THE CLERK OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL CAN BE MORE INVOLVED	
[illegible]	[illegible]
Participate in formulation and communication of Government's goals/objectives	36.0%
Communicate Cabinet feedback on departmental strategic directions or be the one to vet and give the feedback	28.0%
Communicate whether Government committed to business planning & performance measurement and if so, establish clear parameters of expectations from depts.	20.0%
Show strong leadership/champion business planning and performance measurement	16.0%

Question:

Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents were asked to provide their perception of the role that the Secretary to Treasury Board played in the past with respect to business planning and performance measurement. Respondents were also asked to indicate any changes they would like to see with respect to the role of the Secretary to Treasury Board in this initiative.

Response:

- The overarching perspective of respondents on the role of the Secretary to Treasury Board is that it focussed on controllership.

TABLE 6

ON THE PAST ROLE OF SECRETARY TO TREASURY BOARD IN RELATION TO BUSINESS PLANNING & PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT	
[illegible]	[illegible]
Controlled and managed the process	80.0%
Genuineness of commitment and support questionable	13.3%
Involved in policy-setting	3.3%
Played a "great role" (respondents provided no e.g.s)	3.3%

- In responding to what future role the Secretary should play, a substantial number of respondents (86.0%) felt change was needed. Only 14.0% are of the view that no change is necessary. Those seeking change did not always distinguish between the role of the Secretary and the role of the Treasury Board Secretariat. Table 7 presents the desired changes identified by respondents.

TABLE 7

WHAT IS THE DESIRED ROLE OF THE SECRETARY OF TREASURY BOARD IN RELATION TO BUSINESS PLANNING & PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT?

Clarify linkage between business planning and estimates process	28.0%
Ensure linkage with policy-setting aspects of business planning	28.0%
Initiate change in role of Manitoba Measures staff (several respondents indicated the need for more direct, hands-on involvement and facilitation)	20.0%
Facilitate inter-departmental co-ordination of business plans	8.0%
More flexible guidelines on format of business plans	8.0%
Other miscellaneous	8.0%

Indicator No. 2: Those tasked with central co-ordination provide guidance, direction, facilitation and co-ordination across departments.

Question:

Business planning and performance measurement Co-ordinators were asked to describe how Manitoba Measures assists their department's process of developing a business plan and performance measures. Co-ordinators were also asked to identify any changes they would like to see regarding the way in which Manitoba Measures has carried out its functions.

Response:

- Essentially, the role of Manitoba Measures is perceived to have focussed on the preparation of guidelines, manuals, training information, etc., and providing feedback on the business plan and performance indicators.

TABLE 8

ROLES PERFORMED BY MANITOBA MEASURES

Preparation of printed information	72.0%
Providing feedback on business plans and performance indicators	72.0%
Responding to questions from co-ordinators as they arise	50.0%

Note: In some tables percentages do not total 100% because in response to some questions respondents may give more than one response.

- A large majority of respondents (77.0%) want to see changes in Manitoba Measures. Less than one quarter of respondents (22.0%) feel that no change is needed at this time.
- Of those who suggested that changes are needed to Manitoba Measures, two types of shifts were essentially identified:
  - 57.0% suggested the need for more expertise in businesses planning and performance measurement;
  - 50.0% requested that Manitoba Measures provide more active and direct support (examples given include: helping departments develop performance indicators, making an effort to understand departmental context, focussing on the substance of business plans rather than format).

Question:

Manitoba Measures was asked whether any process is or would be in place in the future to co-ordinate the content of departmental business plans between departments and to co-ordinate the selection and collection of performance indicators among departments.

Response:

- Manitoba Measures indicated that their focus at this time is to build capacity among departments to prepare business plans and performance indicators. On that basis, co-ordination of the content of business plans and the selection and collection of performance indicators was seen as premature at this time. In regards to co-ordinating the selection and collection of performance indicators, Manitoba Measures indicated that this is likely three years away because decisions need to be made first of all about which indicators will be used, the feasibility and cost of selecting particular indicators as well as the meaningfulness of indicators selected.

Indicator No. 3: Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers provide direction and support within their individual departments.

Question:

Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents were asked to describe their role and involvement in their department's business planning and performance measurement process.

Response:

- Without exception, deputies described their role in relation to their department's business planning and performance measurement process as one of leadership.
- Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents described their role in one of two ways:
  - as a team member on their department's business planning and performance measurement steering committee/executive management committee (55.0%); or
  - as the person responsible for ensuring that a business plan with performance measures is prepared (45.0%).
- Respondents who identified their role as team members described their input as twofold. One is to participate in shaping the strategic direction of the plan; the other is to work with their branch/division to develop their program profiles (branch/division objectives, strategies, actions, performance indicators).

- Those who indicated they are primarily responsible for plan preparation described their role as overall co-ordination, guidance, support and facilitation to the process in their department.
- In describing their role, 66.0% of all Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents demonstrated some degree of active involvement. Respondents cited the following as examples of their active leadership:
    - attempting to "champion" the process and to "sell" staff on business planning and performance measurement;
    - personally investing many hours in the process;
    - giving direction to the department on the process to be followed;
    - experimenting with centralized versus decentralized approaches to developing the business plan (i.e., different approaches to involving more staff in the process);
    - organizing staff training in the area of performance measurement;
    - convening special planning sessions/workshops; and
    - providing guidance and support to business planning co-ordinators.

Question:

Business planning and performance measurement Co-ordinators were asked how and at what points their Deputy Minister and Assistant Deputy Minister/ Executive Equivalent were involved in the business planning and performance measurement process.

Response:

- A large majority of Co-ordinators (83.0%) indicated that their Deputy Minister was involved at the "front-end" of the process in the identification of the department's strategic direction (establishing the vision, mission, goals). In some cases, the "front-end" involvement included deputies establishing guidelines and expectations with respect to the business planning and performance measurement process to be followed.
- A large majority of Co-ordinators (94.0%) indicated that their Assistant Deputy Minister/Executive Equivalent is involved in the process of preparing program profiles and/or participates in the process of developing the department's strategic direction.

CRITERIA: PLANNING

SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS

- All departments have a defined process by which to develop their business plan and performance indicators.
- Almost all departments have felt the need at sometime or other to hire the services of a facilitator to assist them with the process.
- A large majority of departments involve staff from different units within their department in the business planning and performance measurement process.
- A large majority of departments attempt to communicate with all staff about the business plan. However, the method of communication is essentially passive

(e.g., the plan is made available electronically or availability is at the discretion of managers/directors). It is the exception rather than the rule that departments attempt more active approaches such as producing a synopsis of the business plan for distribution to all staff.

- Most business planning and performance measurement co-ordinators look to their executive management and Manitoba Measures for problem-solving.
- While direction from senior management in departments is primarily clear and decisive, direction from the Treasury Board Secretariat is often subject to change or contradiction.

DETAILED ANALYSIS

Sub-criteria: Development Process

Indicator No. 1: Departments have a defined process by which to proceed.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked to describe the way in which their department has set about to develop its vision, mission, goals, objectives, performance indicators, etc. in the business plan (i.e. the planning process they followed).

Response:

- The majority of departments followed one of two approaches to developing their business plan:
  - 50.0% of respondents indicated that their department followed a top-down approach with their executive management committee developing the vision, mission, goals and the divisional/branch staff then developing strategies, actions and performance indicators;
  - 44.4% indicated that their department followed a bottom-up approach by establishing a business planning working committee with divisional/branch representation; under this approach, the role of executive management committee tended to be that of reviewing and finalizing the business plan;
  - The remaining 5.5% represent a "mixed" approach in which an annual session is held with a department's executive management committee and a broad cross-section of departmental staff to set the strategic direction of the business plan, and then working groups of staff are established to develop various components of the plan.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance indicators were asked whether their department hired a facilitator to facilitate any aspect of the process of preparing a business plan and performance indicators.

Response:

- Almost all departments (80%) have used the services of a consultant facilitator to help them through the process of developing a business plan and performance indicators.

M121

IMPORTANT NOTE CONCERNING THE FOLLOWING PAGES

THE PAGES WHICH FOLLOW HAVE BEEN FILMED TWICE IN ORDER TO OBTAIN THE BEST REPRODUCTIVE QUALITY

USERS SHOULD CONSULT ALL THE PAGES REPRODUCED ON THE FICHE IN ORDER TO OBTAIN A COMPLETE READING OF THE TEXT.

REMARQUE IMPORTANTE CONCERNANT LES PAGES QUI SUIVENT

LES PAGES SUIVANTES ONT ÉTÉ REPRODUITES EN DOUBLE AFIN D'AMÉLIORER LA QUALITÉ DE REPRODUCTION

LES UTILISATEURS DOIVENT CONSULTER TOUTES LES PAGES REPRODUITES SUR LA FICHE AFIN D'OBTENIR LA LECTURE DU TEXTE INTÉGRAL

micromedia
a division of IHS Canada

20 Victoria Street
Toronto, Ontario M5C 2N8
Tel.: (416) 362-5211
Toll Free: 1-800-387-2689
Fax: (416) 362-6161
Email: info@micromedia.on.ca

TABLE 9

HOW DEPARTMENTS HAVE USED CONSULTANT FACILITATORS

Response	% Respondents
To identify strategic direction of the department	75.0%
To develop other components of the plan (e.g. performance indicators, lines of business, program profiles, strengths/ weaknesses)	42.0%
To facilitate entire process	8.3%

Question:

Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers, Executive Equivalents and Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked to rank on a scale of 1 to 10 how well each of their department's business planning process and the quality of their business plans.

Manitoba Measures was also asked to give a general ranking on government's business planning process and the overall quality of business plans. They declined to respond to these questions on the grounds that it would be premature to rank departments given that business planning is at the developmental stage.

Response:

- Tables 10 and 11 indicate the ranking that respondents gave to their business planning and performance measurement process and product. The strengths and weaknesses of the process as perceived by respondents is summarized in Table 12.

TABLE 10

RANKING ON DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS PLANNING PROCESS

Ranking Selected (1 is very poor, 10 is exceptional)	% Respondents
9	4.0%
8	36.7%
7	20.4%
6	18.3%
5	14.3%
4	4.0%
3	2.0%

Average Rank: 6.7

TABLE 11

RANKING ON QUALITY OF BUSINESS PLANS

Ranking Selected (1 is very poor, 10 is exceptional)	% Respondents
9	6.2%
8	41.6%
7	12.5%
6	16.6%
5	18.7%
4	4.1%

Average Rank: 6.8

Indicator No. 2: Departments involve staff from different units within their department.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of the business planning and performance measurement process were asked to indicate how and at what points staff from different units within their department are involved in the process of developing the business plan.

TABLE 9

HOW DEPARTMENTS HAVE USED CONSULTANT FACILITATORS	
[illegible]	[illegible]
To identify strategic direction of the department	75.0%
To develop other components of the plan (e.g. performance indicators, lines of business, program profiles, strengths/weaknesses)	42.0%
To facilitate entire process	8.3%

Question:

Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents and Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked to rank on a scale of 1 to 10 how they would rate their department's business planning process and the quality of their business plan.

Manitoba Measures was also asked to give a general ranking on departments' business planning process and the overall quality of business plans. They declined to respond to these questions on the grounds that it would be premature to rank departments given that business planning is at the developmental stage.

Response:

- Tables 10 and 11 indicate the ranking that respondents gave to their business planning and performance measurement process and product. The strengths and weaknesses of the process as perceived by respondents is summarized in Table 12.

TABLE 10

RANKING ON DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS PLANNING PROCESS	
[illegible]	[illegible]
9	4.0%
8	36.7%
7	20.4%
6	18.3%
5	14.3%
4	4.0%
3	2.0%
[illegible]	

TABLE 11

RANKING ON QUALITY OF BUSINESS PLANS	
[illegible]	[illegible]
9	6.2%
8	41.6%
7	12.5%
6	16.6%
5	18.7%
4	4.1%
[illegible]	

Indicator No. 2: Departments involve staff from different units within their department.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of the business planning and performance measurement process were asked to indicate how and at what points staff from different units within their department are involved in the process of developing the business plan.

Response:

- A large majority of respondents (88.8%) indicated that their business planning and performance measurement process involves a cross-section of staff in activities such as developing program profiles, performance indicators, and the environmental scan/risk analysis.
- 11.0% of respondents indicated that their department relies almost exclusively on their executive management committee and their business planning committee to develop the business plan.

TABLE 12

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS PLANNING & PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROCESS

Response	% Respondents
STRENGTHS OF PROCESS	
A good cross-section of staff involved	28.5%
Support from executive management committee (e.g. dedication of staff resources)	24.5%
Use of consultant facilitator	6.0%
Other miscellaneous	2.0%
WEAKNESSES OF PROCESS	
Need for broader cross-section of staff involved	12.0%
Inadequate resources allocated to the process	6.0%
Treasury Board guidelines lacked flexibility to accommodate departmental differences	6.0%
Need to involve Minister in process	4.0%
Need to use the process as a departmental management tool	4.0%
Other miscellaneous responses	6.0%

Indicator No. 3: Departments communicate with all staff about the business plan.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked how and at what points the content of the business plan has been shared with all staff.

Response:

- 88.8% of respondents said that their department attempts to disseminate information on the content of the plan within the department. These respondents indicated that sharing information on the business plan essentially happens in one of two ways:
  - *reliance on managers/directors to share the content of the plan with staff (50.0%);*
  - *broad based attempts to share the content of the plan (50.0%); examples given by some respondents are: the plan is electronically available to departmental staff; a summary of the plan is prepared and distributed to all staff.*
- 11.0% of respondents indicated that their department does not take steps to share the content of the business plan with departmental staff.

Sub-criteria: Problem Solving

Indicator No. 1: A mechanism is in place for resolution of difficulties that arise in preparing a business plan and performance indicators.

Indicator No. 2: Decision-making related to problem solving is clear, decisive and can be counted on to endure.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators were asked to indicate who they look to for guidance in resolving problems that come up during the process of preparing a business plan and performance measures. They were also asked to indicate whether they felt the advice they received was clear and decisive (i.e., once a decision is made, it is generally not subject to being changed).

Response:

- Most Departmental Co-ordinators look to their senior management and Manitoba Measures/Treasury Board analyst for guidance when there is a need to resolve a problem related to business planning and performance measurement.
- Typically respondents found that the guidance/direction given in those circumstances was clear and decisive from their senior management, but not so from Manitoba Measures/Treasury Board analyst.

TABLE 13

WHO DEPARTMENTAL COORDINATORS LOOK TO FOR PROBLEM-SOLVING

Rely on senior management in the department and Manitoba Measures/Treasury Board analyst	44.4%
Rely only on Manitoba Measures/Treasury Board analyst	33.3%
Rely only on senior management in the department	11.1%
Rely on other departmental co-ordinators and Manitoba Measures/Treasury Board analyst	5.5%
Rely only on other departmental co-ordinators	5.5%

TABLE 14

WAS ADVICE GIVEN TO CO-ORDINATORS CLEAR AND DECISIVE

Advice from departmental senior management clear and decisive	77.7%
Advice from Manitoba Measures/Treasury Board Analyst clear and decisive	33.3%

CRITERIA: CLIENT FOCUS

SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS

- Departments do not generally provide their clients with opportunities to have input into and influence over business plan priorities/strategic directions and performance measures.
- By contrast, most departments do measure client satisfaction. Although this is at present limited to soliciting feedback on only some departmental programs.

DETAILED ANALYSIS

Sub-criteria: Client Input

Indicator No. 1: Clients have opportunities for input into and influence over business plan priorities/strategic directions and the performance measures.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked if their department involved clients in the process of developing the business plan and performance measures.

Response:

- Over half the respondents indicated that clients are not involved in their business planning and performance measurement process.

TABLE 15

CLIENT INPUT INTO THE BUSINESS PLANNING & PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROCESS	
[illegible]	[illegible]
No input	60.0%
Input through client surveys	40.0%
IMPACT OF CLIENT INPUT	
[illegible]	[illegible]
Client input influenced Departmental strategic direction/proposed actions	83.0%
Client input had no influence due to resource constraints	16.6%

Sub-criteria: Client Satisfaction

Indicator No. 1: Client satisfaction is measured.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked whether their department was presently measuring client satisfaction.

Response:

- Most departments (73.0%) measure client satisfaction essentially through surveys. Close to one-third of departments do not measure client satisfaction.

- Table 16 shows that the majority of those who measure client satisfaction, are doing it for only some programs/objectives identified in their business plan.

TABLE 16

EXTENT TO WHICH CLIENT SATISFACTION IS BEING MEASURED

SATISFACTION MEASURED FOR:	
All programs/objectives	0.0%
Most programs/objectives	18.0%
Some programs/objectives	54.5%
Few programs/objectives	27.0%

CRITERIA: HUMAN RESOURCES

SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS

- Staff assigned to co-ordinate the business planning and performance measurement process within their department identified performance measurement and client feedback/client survey design as the areas where they would like to further their expertise.
- Manitoba Measures staff did not identify areas where they feel they need skills building.
- In terms of networking, departmental co-ordinators rely almost exclusively on the Manitoba Measures Co-ordinators Council. Manitoba Measures on the other hand is more active in its networking.

DETAILED ANALYSIS

Sub-criteria: Skills and Training

Indicator No. 1: Qualified staff are assigned to co-ordinate the process within departments and centrally.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked whether there are any skills they felt they needed to acquire in their role as co-ordinator of their department's business planning and performance measurement process.

Response:

- Most respondents (65.0%) felt they needed some skills training while 35.0% said they did not feel they needed any training at this time to perform their duties as co-ordinator.
- Table 17 shows that of those who feel they need some skills building, the overwhelming majority (91.0%) want training related to performance measurement.

TABLE 17

TRAINING SOUGHT BY CO-ORDINATORS OF BUSINESS PLANNING & PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT	
Training related to performance measurement (some specified they want to be able to determine good outcome measures)	91.0%
Training in measuring client feedback/client survey design	45.0%
Training in benchmarking	18.0%
Training in facilitating the process	18.0%

Question:

Manitoba Measures was asked whether there are any skills they felt they needed to acquire in relation to their role as central co-ordinator of business planning and performance measurement.

Response:

- Manitoba Measures did not identify any future training that they feel they need. They indicated however that they are developing their skills on an on-going basis through their networking activities. As well, a staff person from Manitoba Measures has taken the "Train the Trainer" workshop offered by Organization and Staff Development and has almost completed a customized workshop on "Train the Manitoba Measures Trainer".

Indicator No. 2: Networking and other similar opportunities are available to persons assigned to co-ordinate the process within departments and centrally.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked whether they participated in any networking opportunities related to business planning and performance measurement.

Response:

- The majority of respondents engage in networking. Nearly all those who network rely almost exclusively on the Manitoba Measures Co-ordinators Council - an internal committee of Manitoba Measures and departmental co-ordinators (see Table 18).

TABLE 18

DO CO-ORDINATORS NETWORK?	
Yes	83.3%
No	16.6%
TYPE OF NETWORKING ACTIVITY	
Manitoba Measures/Co-ordinators Council	93.3%
Conferences/workshops	13.3%
Consultation with other departmental co-ordinators	13.3%

Question:

Manitoba Measures was asked if they participated in any networking opportunities related to business planning and performance measurement.

Response:

- Manitoba Measures indicated that they are involved in networking in the following ways:
  - the Manitoba Measures Co-ordinators Council;
  - the Conference Board of Canada Network on Accountability and Performance Measurement;
  - networking with some municipal representatives from the City of Winnipeg; and
  - networking internationally through the internet.

CRITERIA: PROCESS MANAGEMENT

SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS

Co-ordination

- Inter-departmental co-ordination and harmonization of business plans and performance indicators appears to be virtually absent. For the most part, individual departments are not attempting any co-ordination with departments engaged in complementary activities and Manitoba Measures does not as the central co-ordinating body undertake to fulfill this function. Manitoba Measures is of the view that business planning is at the developmental stages and therefore co-ordination between departments on the content of the plan and their indicators is not necessary.
- Virtually all departments attempt to ensure that business plans address and are consistent with Government priorities.

Monitoring and Data Collection

- Most departments are involved to some degree in monitoring progress in the implementation of their business plan. However, a systematic approach throughout divisions/branches within a department is generally lacking.
- While all departments are collecting performance data, the majority are only collecting data for some or a few of the indicators they have selected.
- Less than one third of departments have a structured process for collecting performance data.

Outcome of Performance Measurement

- The results of performance analysis are largely impacting on the decision-making of departments and to a lesser extent on Treasury Board. These appear to be the primary users of performance information.
- In a few, limited cases, clients/other levels of government have access to performance data.

Accountability Reporting

- A few departments noted that the vision, mission and goals in their business plan appear in their annual report. In the case of special operating agencies,

annual reports tend to provide performance information. Some inter-governmental agreements require performance information to be reported/shared with the parties to the agreement.

- Accountability reporting is essentially to the deputy minister, the minister of a department and Treasury Board.

DETAILED ANALYSIS

Sub-criteria: Co-ordination

Indicator No. 1: A process is in place for ensuring interdepartmental co-ordination and harmonization of business plans and performance indicators.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked to describe any co-ordination that may be taking place between their department and other departments in relation to the content of their business plan and the selection and collection of performance data.

Response:

- 87.0% of respondents indicated that there is currently no co-ordination taking place between their department and any other department in relation to the content of their business plan.
- 13.0% of respondents indicated there is some consultation between individual branches in different departments. Respondents did not explain the nature and scope of the consultations.
- 87.0% of respondents indicated that there is currently no co-ordination taking place between their department and any other department in the selection and collection of performance data.
- 13.0% of respondents felt that through meetings of the Manitoba Measures Co-ordinators Council, the exchange and sharing gives them a sense of the types of performance indicators that other departments are considering.

Question:

Manitoba Measures was asked whether any process is or would be in place in the future to co-ordinate the content of departmental business plans between departments and to co-ordinate the selection and collection of performance indicators among departments.

Response:

- Manitoba Measures indicated that their focus at this time is to build capacity among departments to prepare business plans and performance indicators. On that basis, co-ordination of the content of business plans and the selection and collection of performance indicators was seen as premature at this time. In regards to co-ordinating the selection and collection of performance indicators, Manitoba Measures indicated that this is likely three years away because decisions need to be made first of all about which indicators will be used, the feasibility and cost of selecting particular indicators as well as the meaningfulness of indicators selected.

Indicator No. 2: A process is in place to ensure that business plans address Government priorities and are consistent with Government priorities.

Question:

Departmental co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked how their department ensured that their business plan addressed government priorities and was consistent with government priorities.

Response:

- 94.4% of respondents indicated that they used the previous government's "corporate framework", consultations with their Treasury Board analyst, the Throne Speech, the Budget Address and their deputy minister as sources of information on government priorities which they then attempted to address and be consistent with in their business plan.
- A small percentage (5.5%) indicated that their business plan fails to link the department's objectives/strategic direction with government priorities.

Sub-criteria: Monitoring and Data Collection

Indicator No. 1: A system is in place to monitor progress in implementing the business plan.

Question:

Departmental co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked if their department has a system in place for monitoring the business plan. They were also asked to describe their method of data collection.

Response:

- 77.7% of respondents indicated that their department had some form of monitoring.
- As Table 19 shows, there is a lot of variability in the approach to monitoring among those who indicated that their department monitors progress in plan implementation.

TABLE 19

HOW IS THE BUSINESS PLAN MONITORED?	
Through quarterly progress reports	36.0%
Monitoring teams/committees established	28.5%
Through executive management committee	14.0%
Miscellaneous	21.5%

Indicator No. 2: Performance indicators that focus on outcomes have been developed.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of Business Planning and Performance Measurement were asked what progress their department has made in determining its performance indicators and how they would characterize most of these indicators (i.e. input, output, outcome measures).

Response:

- Slightly more than half the departments have selected some performance indicators for their business plan objectives/program. The break-down is as follows in Table 20.

TABLE 20

PROGRESS IN DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	
All indicators selected	13.3%
Most indicators selected	20.0%
Some indicators selected	53.3%
Few indicators selected	13.3%

- In terms of how respondents would characterize most of their performance indicators, half of them said the majority of their indicators are output measures (Table 21).
- Outcome measures do not yet play a prominent role in the performance measurement process (Table 21).

TABLE 21

CHARACTERIZATION OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	
The majority are output measures	50.0%
The majority are more or less an equal number of input, output and outcome measures	27.7%
The majority are input and output measures	11.0%
Other miscellaneous	11.0%

Indicator No. 3: A system is in place for collecting data on performance and data is being collected.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance indicators were asked whether their department was gathering data on its performance and whether it had a structured process in place to collect the performance data.

Response:

- As Table 22 shows, departments are at different stages in collecting performance data.

TABLE 22

COLLECTION OF PERFORMANCE DATA	
Data being collected for all performance indicators selected by the department	20.0%
Data being collected for most indicators	13.3%
Data being collected for some indicators	33.3%
Data being collected for few indicators	33.3%

- Less than one third of departments have a structured process in place for collecting performance data (26.6%); 73.3% indicated it is essentially up to individual divisions/branches how data is collected.

M121

IMPORTANT NOTE CONCERNING THE FOLLOWING PAGES

THE PAGES WHICH FOLLOW HAVE BEEN FILMED TWICE IN ORDER TO OBTAIN THE BEST REPRODUCTIVE QUALITY

USERS SHOULD CONSULT ALL THE PAGES REPRODUCED ON THE FICHE IN ORDER TO OBTAIN A COMPLETE READING OF THE TEXT.

REMARQUE IMPORTANTE CONCERNANT LES PAGES QUI SUIVENT

LES PAGES SUIVANTES ONT ÉTÉ REPRODUITES EN DOUBLE AFIN D'AMÉLIORER LA QUALITÉ DE REPRODUCTION

LES UTILISATEURS DOIVENT CONSULTER TOUTES LES PAGES REPRODUITES SUR LA FICHE AFIN D'OBTENIR LA LECTURE DU TEXTE INTÉGRAL

micromedia
a division of IHS Canada

20 Victoria Street
Toronto, Ontario M5C 2N8
Tel.: (416) 362-5211
Toll Free: 1-800-387-2689
Fax: (416) 362-6161
Email: info@micromedia.on.ca

Question:

Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents and Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked to rank on a scale of 1 to 10 the quality of their performance indicators.

Manitoba Measures was also asked to give a general ranking on the overall quality of performance indicators developed by departments. They declined to respond to this question on the grounds that it would be premature to rank departments given that business planning is at the developmental stage.

Response:

- The average rank for the quality of performance indicators is 5.4 - well below the average rank for the business planning process or the quality of the business plan (6.7 and 6.8, respectively).

TABLE 23

RANKING ON QUALITY OF DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Ranking Selected (1 is very poor, 10 is exceptional)	*% Respondents*
8	2.0%
7	29.0%
6	23.0%
5	16.6%
4	19.0%
3	4.2%
2	4.2%
1	2.0%
Average Rank: 5.4	

Sub-criteria: Outcome of Performance Measurement

Indicator No. 1: The results of performance analysis impact on decision-making by departments and Government.

Question:

Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents and Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement where asked how information on actual performance is being used.

Response:

- 77.0% of respondents indicated that performance information is being used; only 23.0% said that it is not being used by anybody.
- Those who indicated that performance information is not being used are from departments where the performance measurement process is in its initial stages with only few indicators being collected at this time.

Question:

Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents and Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked to rank on a scale of 1 to 10 the quality of their performance indicators.

Manitoba Measures was also asked to give a general ranking on the overall quality of performance indicators developed by departments. They declined to respond to this question on the grounds that it would be premature to rank departments given that business planning is at the developmental stage.

Response:

- The average rank for the quality of performance indicators is 5.4 - well below the average rank for the business planning process or the quality of the business plan (6.7 and 6.8, respectively).

TABLE 23

RANKING ON QUALITY OF DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

[illegible]	[illegible]
8	2.0%
7	29.0%
6	23.0%
5	16.6%
4	19.0%
3	4.2%
2	4.2%
1	2.0%
[illegible]	

Sub-criteria: Outcome of Performance Measurement

Indicator No. 1: The results of performance analysis impact on decision-making by departments and Government.

Question:

Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents and Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement where asked how information on actual performance is being used.

Response:

- 77.0% of respondents indicated that performance information is being used; only 23.0% said that it is not being used by anybody.
- Those who indicated that performance information is not being used are from departments where the performance measurement process is in its initial stages with only few indicators being collected at this time.

TABLE 24

PERCEPTION OF DEPUTY MINISTERS, ASSISTANT DEPUTY MINISTERS AND DEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATORS ON HOW PERFORMANCE INFORMATION IS USED

	[illegible]
BY DEPARTMENTS	100.0%
In decisions on resource allocations	
In policy/program planning adjustments	
In Cabinet/Treasury Board submissions	
BY TREASURY BOARD SECRETARIAT	57.0%
To review estimates	
To review departmental Treasury Board submissions	
BY MINISTER	32.0%
In relation to specific issues/complaints	
To give feedback on departmental strategic direction/priorities	
BY CABINET	12.0%
In relation to specific issues/complaints	
In making a policy/program decision	
BY CLIENTS/OTHER LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT	12.0%
Relates to partnership agreements with other governments	
Relates to situations where clients are other government departments or special operating agencies serving the public	

Sub-criteria: Accountability Reporting

Indicator No. 1: Broad parameters of the content of business plans is available to the public.

Question:

Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked if their department's business plan is shared with the public in any form (i.e. it can be a summary or other type of document; not necessarily the business plan itself).

Response:

- The majority of departments (73.3%) do not share with the public the content of their business plan in any form.
- Only 26.6% of departments share, to a limited extent the content of their department's business plan - i.e. high level strategic direction: vision, mission, goals.

Indicator No. 2: Reporting to clients and citizens at large on results of performance.

Question:

Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents and Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement were asked whether their department reports on the achievement of its business plan objectives and to whom.

Response:

- 88.0% of respondents indicated that their department is engaged in some form of reporting on performance measurement while 12.2% indicated that no reporting is taking place to date.

TABLE 25

FOR THOSE DEPARTMENTS THAT REPORT ON PERFORMANCE, TO WHOM IS THE INFORMATION PROVIDED	
Treasury Board	86.0%
The Minister of the Department	65.0%
The Public via the Annual Report	25.5%
Deputy Minister/Executive Management Committee of the Department (primarily via quarterly reporting)	23.2%
Cabinet	7.0%

Question:

Manitoba Measures was asked to describe how it anticipated becoming involved in future in developing the format, content and manner of performance reporting by government departments.

Response:

- Manitoba Measures advised that this will depend on the Government's intentions in regards to business planning and performance measurement. Manitoba Measures anticipates that in future it will provide commentary on proposed indicators and the appropriateness of indicators.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Question:

Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers/Executive Equivalents, Departmental Co-ordinators of business planning and performance measurement and Manitoba Measures were asked for any comments they might have regarding changes they would like to see in the way in which business planning and performance measurement is being implemented in Government.

Response:

- Manitoba Measures indicated that they will be making recommendations to the new Government on the future of Manitoba Measures and until such time they did not consider it appropriate to share their suggestions.
- From Table 26, it is clear that the top two priorities for respondents are integration of business planning with the estimates process as well as leadership from government.

TABLE 26

TOP SIX CHANGES SOUGHT BY DEPUTY MINISTERS, ASSISTANT DEPUTY MINISTERS/EXECUTIVE EQUIVALENTS AND DEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATORS

Link business planning to estimates process	43.5%
Government commitment, leadership and involvement (several indicated that business plans should go through a government review/approval process)	35.0%
Involve the public/encourage exchange between departments	28.3%
Format of business plans to be more concise and more flexible (instead of a "one size fits all")	26.0%
Assistance/training in performance measurement	11.0%
Changes in the role of the Manitoba Measures/Treasury Board Secretariat: - more leadership - focus more on reviewing content of business plans versus format - improve quality of feedback via annual management letters on business plan	11.0%
Interdepartmental co-ordination of business plans	9.0%

Follow-up on Previous Recommendations from the Provincial Auditor

The Provincial Auditor requested in writing that the Treasury Board Secretariat provide us with their response to each of the Provincial Auditor's 1997 and 1998 recommendations regarding Manitoba Measures. The Treasury Board Secretariat responded that while their staff agree with many of the recommendations previously made by the Provincial Auditor, implementation of such changes has not proceeded at this time. The Secretariat indicated that there are many pressing issues facing the new Government and as a result, the Secretariat has not yet had an opportunity to brief the new administration on the Manitoba Measures initiative. They expect to be in a position to do so in the coming months.

Overall Assessment

Based on the assessment criteria detailed in this report, our overall conclusion is that most departments have developed as effective a process as they can within the existing framework of the guidelines and directives of Manitoba Measures. Certain elements that are critical to the effectiveness of the business planning and performance measurement process have either not yet been incorporated into the process or else they have only been partially developed (e.g. systematic monitoring, inter-departmental co-ordination, public reporting on performance, integration of planning and budgeting). Departments await direction from the centraladministration on these matters. As such, the sooner further central direction can be provided to departments the sooner needed improvements in the process can be implemented.

Key Recommendations

STRATEGIC DIRECTION AND LEADERSHIP INVOLVEMENT

- Cabinet needs to establish and periodically review a Government-wide Corporate Framework within which departments can develop business plans and performance measures that contribute to the implementation of the Corporate Framework.
- The Clerk of Executive Council needs to develop a procedure and format for Cabinet or a committee of Cabinet to review and endorse the proposed strategic direction of departments, their key outcomes and key performance indicators.
- The Secretary to Treasury Board needs to develop a procedure and format for Treasury Board ministers to review and approve each department's business plan and performance indicators.

BUSINESS PLANNING AND BUDGETING

- Government should consider the merits of having both the Clerk of Executive Council and the Secretary to Treasury Board co-lead the business planning and performance measurement initiative in order to reinforce that this process is as much about planning and policy setting as it is about finances.
- The Treasury Board Secretariat should explore leading practices in North America in order to develop, for Treasury Board ministers' approval, the proposed approach for the integration of estimates with the business planning process.
- The Treasury Board Secretariat should prepare for Treasury Board ministers' consideration, an assessment of the implications of instituting multi-year fiscal planning at the departmental level.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

- The Treasury Board Secretariat should prepare, for approval by Treasury Board ministers, options for delegation of authority to departments once their business plan is approved.

CLIENT INPUT

- Those who will in future be responsible for central co-ordination need to develop for Cabinet approval options for obtaining input from clients and citizens in the process of setting government-wide as well as departmental strategic goals and performance indicators.

SKILLS AND EXPERTISE

- The Clerk of Executive Council and the Secretary to Treasury Board as the administrative co-leaders need to provide departments with access to a team of persons with direct experience in facilitating business planning and performance measurement. Each facilitator should be assigned to approximately four or five departments, that are functionally inter-related. Their role would be to provide departments with direct, hands-on assistance in refining their business plans and, in particular, their performance measures.
- Those who will in future be charged with central co-ordination need to provide departmental staff with opportunities to expand their knowledge and experience with business planning and performance measurement. For instance, use the

inter-departmental co-ordinators network to identify the areas where departmental co-ordinators are seeking to increase their knowledge and provide workshops in those areas as well as guest speakers from other jurisdictions to share their positive experiences/lessons learned with business planning and performance measurement.

CO-ORDINATION OF PLANS AND INDICATORS

- The Clerk of Executive Council and the Secretary to Treasury Board should co-chair a steering committee of the deputy ministers with the primary objective of providing deputies with a forum to ensure inter-departmental co-ordination in business planning and performance measurement and to resolve emerging issues and challenges.
- In future, the evaluation of business plans and performance indicators by central co-ordinators or Treasury Board analysts should include observations to Treasury Board ministers on any issues in the plans that relate to inter-departmental co-ordination.

MONITORING, DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

- Those charged with central co-ordination of business plans should establish a protocol for departments to follow in regards to monitoring of business plan implementation, performance data collection and reporting.

OUTCOME INDICATORS

- Government needs to emphasize to the central administration that greater emphasis needs to be placed on outcome indicators.
- The Clerk of Executive Council and the Secretary to Treasury Board need to ensure that departmental staff have access to expertise to assist them in developing outcome indicators.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTING

- The Clerk of Executive Council and the Secretary to Treasury Board should strike a committee to develop for Cabinet's approval a new format for departmental annual reports that include reporting on business plans and performance.

Key Questions to Consider

Fundamental questions that we suggest need to be considered in relation to the above recommendations are:

- What amount of time is appropriate for ministers to devote to business planning and performance reporting?
- Are ministers willing to let public servants and clients/stakeholders participate in the development of meaningful indicators?
- How can central government staff develop the capacities to assist and challenge departments?
- How can the right information systems be developed?
- What incentives can be designed to encourage ministers and the administration to analyze and utilize performance-based information?
- To what extent should remuneration be based on performance?

Government Position

The Government of Manitoba is committed to the advancement of performance measurement within the government management processes with a strong focus on the measurement of outcomes and results.

PROVINCIAL AUDITORS Province of Manitoba

Over 100 Years of Service

Alexander Begg	**Provincial Auditor**	**1876 - 1879**
Walter R. Nursey	**Provincial Auditor**	**1879 - 1888**
George Black	**Provincial Auditor**	**1888 - 1916**
J. Gordon Steele	**Comptroller-General**	**1916 - 1921**
Robert Drummond	**Comptroller-General**	**1921 - 1933**
J.C.M. Ligertwood	**Comptroller-General**	**1933 - 1936**
F.B. Brisbin	**Comptroller-General**	**1936 - 1938**
C.A. Glover	**Comptroller-General**	**1938 - 1944**
George D. Iliffe	**Comptroller-General**	**1944 - 1966**
James G. McFee	**Comptroller-General** **Provincial Auditor**	**1966 - 1969** **1969 - 1972**
W.K. (Bill) Ziprick	**Provincial Auditor**	**1972 - 1985**
Fred H. Jackson	**Provincial Auditor**	**1985 - 1992**
Carol Bellringer	**Provincial Auditor**	**1992 - 1996**
Jon W. Singleton	**Provincial Auditor**	**1996 - Current**

Copies of this report may be obtained by contacting:

Office of the Provincial Auditor

500–330 PORTAGE AVENUE

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA CANADA R3C 0C4

PHONE: 204 945 3790 FAX: 204 945 2169

EMAIL: shumbert@pao.mb.ca